

**REMARKS**

Applicants thank the Examiner for withdrawing the rejections of claims 1 - 15 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph. In the office action, claims 1 - 27 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,049,823 to Hwang (hereinafter "Hwang "). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejections of record.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e)

Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) in view of Hwang. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Independent claim 1 is directed to a method of presenting an audiovisual signal to a user's audiovisual display monitor, including the steps of, *inter alia*:

responding to the command by *assigning an assignable computing device (ACD) to the particular user only*;

presenting a menu containing a selection of video programs to the user's audiovisual display monitor with the ACD.

Independent claim 16 is directed to an apparatus for presenting an audiovisual signal to a user's audiovisual display monitor, and includes similar limitations.

Applicants previously amended claims 1 and 16 to further clarify that a particular ACD is assigned to a particular user and that user alone, i.e., for dedicated service to the particular user, more clearly distinguishing the cited prior art.

Hwang is directed to an interactive television system that renders on-demand interactive multimedia services. (Hwang, Abstract).

In the Office Action, the Examiner asserts that the claimed “assignable computing device” is “broad enough to read on the private viewing session or channel, in Hwang, which is clearly assigned to one and only one particular user at a time, col. 16, lines 5-10.” (Office Action, p. 4). However, Applicants disagree with this characterization of Hwang.

First, an Assignable Computing “Device” cannot be equated to a “viewing session” (which is not a “device”). Examples of an Assignable Computing Device from the Specification include NINTENDO 64 and SONY PLAYSTATION consoles, apple-based personal computers, UNIX-based personal computers, etc. (See Specification, p. 12). These are not “sessions.”

Additionally, the claimed Assignable Computing Device is distinguishable from the “Channel-processor” of Hwang in that the Channel-processor of Hwang is *not*, “clearly assigned to one and only one particular user at a time, col. 16, lines 5-10.” (Office Action, p. 4). To the contrary, the Channel-processors of Hwang “can receive and handle eight telephone communications,” and accordingly act as a server. (Hwang, col. 19, lns. 15-17). They are *not* discrete computing devices *assigned* to one particular user at a time as recited

in claim 1, but rather a content server which may establish communications with numerous users simultaneously.

Even where Hwang suggests that a Channel processor may establish several private channels for communication with users (Hwang, col. 19, lns. 20-25), a single device hosting communications sessions with several users is distinguishable from the *assignment* of a computing device to a single user only.

The Examiner appears to take the position, on pp. 2-3 of the Office Action, that Hwang discloses or suggests this claim limitation because Hwang “may be enabled to operate” to provide services to a single user. (For example, in a scenario in which the entire system includes only a single user who accesses a Channel-processor at a given time). While this may be a possible operating scenario for the system of Hwang, it still does not equate to the “assignment” of a computing device to a particular user only, as required by the claims. The Channel-processor, or host, may be accessed by one or numerous users simultaneously, but this is not an “assignment” of the Channel-processor “to a particular user only.”

The Examiner cites other portions of Hwang as allegedly disclosing the assignment of an Assignable Computing Device to a particular user only. None of the cited portions does.

For example, at col, 10, lines 37-42, the Examiner reads the text as allegedly disclosing this important claimed feature. However, the text discloses no such thing. This cited portion of Hwang does not disclose the assignment of an Assignable Computing Device to a particular user only, but rather describes that a “local channel...may not always be multimedia-capable, because its host Channel-processor can be too busy in providing the private-viewing channel and redirecting possibly all the inquiries from its connected iTVpanels to the desired destinations.” If anything, this text proves that the Channel-processor is *not assigned to a particular user only*, since it is (1) described as a “host Channel-processor” and (2) is connected to and receiving communications from numerous iTV panels, or users, at the same time.

The cited portions of Hwang do not disclose or suggest that a Channel-processor is *assigned* exclusively to a single user. For at least these reasons, Applicants respectfully submit that Hwang cannot anticipate claim 1.

Not only does Hwang fail to disclose assigning an Assignable Computer Device to a particular user only, it in fact teaches precisely the opposite:

In most of the commercial applications, the multimedia on-demand services, such as the interactive TV service in a hotel, are not to be used at all times by one user. For example, not every guest in the hotel room will use the iTV service. Even though, the Channel-processor can only generate one private-viewing interactive TV channel for one user to enjoy, it is not cost-effective to reserve one Channel-processor for only one user. If, for example, the equipment usage rate is to be targeted at 1/8, or 12.5 percent, it is recommended that each Channel-processor be not only shared but also concurrently controlled by 8 users. In the preferred embodiment, the Channel-processor, which is housed in the TeamPro iTVstation and is equipped with multi-tasking capability, can handle 8 up to 16 "interactivities" from 8 up to 16 users concurrently.


Hwang, col. 6, lns. 11-24.

In light of the forgoing, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 1 is in condition for allowance. Additionally, because dependent claims 2-15 contain all of the limitations of the claims from which they depend, Applicants submit that these claims are also in condition for allowance, for at least the same reasons. Moreover, because the remarks above apply with equal force to the rejection of claim 16, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 16 and its corresponding dependent claims 17-27 are in condition for allowance for at least the reasons stated above.

**CONCLUSION**

In view of the foregoing remarks, favorable reconsideration and allowance of claims 1-27 are respectfully solicited. In the event that the application is not deemed in condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned in an effort to advance the prosecution of this application.

Respectfully submitted,



Paul A. Ragusa

PTO Reg. No. 38,587

(212) 408-2588

Robert L. Maier

PTO Reg. No. 54,291

(212) 408-2538

*Attorneys for Applicants*

BAKER BOTTS LLP  
30 Rockefeller Plaza  
New York, NY 10112